

REMARKS

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-15 and 17-25 are pending. Claims 1-12 and 16-19 have been amended. Claims 13-15 and 20-25 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer as drawn to a non-elected invention. Claim 16 was previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claim 26 has been added.

Claim 1 has been amended merely to clarify that “CCT6” refers to “Chaperonin containing T-complex 1 subunit 6”. Support for the amendment is found throughout the specification, in particular at pages 3 and 5.

Claims 2, 4, and 6-8 have been amended to specify the assay system being referred to in the claim. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, particularly at pages 20-31.

New claim 26 recites “[t]he method of claim 8, wherein the nucleic acid modulator is a dsRNA or siRNA.” Support for the new claim can be found throughout the specification, particularly at pages 19 and 38-39.

Withdrawn Rejections

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the withdrawn rejections of claims 1-6 and 8 under 35 USC 102(b) in view of Komblau et al, the withdrawn rejections of claims 1-5, 7 and 8 under 35 USC 102(b) in view of Li et al, and the withdrawn rejections of claims 1 and 8-10 under 35 USC 102(b) in view of US 20030109465.

Rejections under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 2-10 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Office alleged that the claims are confusing because the base claim now has two assay systems and it is not clear which assay system is being referred to. Claims 2-10 have been amended to specify the assay system being referred to, thereby obviating the rejections. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Rejections under 35 USC 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-12 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as allegedly being failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Office alleged that, while the specification has support for “Chaperonin containing T-complex subunit 6”, it does not contain support for “Chaperonin containing T-complex subunit 6A”, as recited in claim 1. Without acceding to the merits of the rejection, claim 1 has been amended to recite “Chaperonin containing T-complex subunit 6”, rendering the rejections moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, the application is considered to be in good and proper form for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 27, 2010

/Anita J. Terpstra/
Anita J. Terpstra
Registration No. 47,132

McDonnell, Boehnen, Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 913-0001